

#### REMARKS

The Examiner's office action of December 6, 2007 has been carefully reviewed. Applicants believe that the claim amendments made hereinabove are sufficient to overcome the various grounds for objection and rejection outlined in the Examiner's Office Action. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

#### 35 U.S.C. §132(a) and 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner initially objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. §132(a), and likewise rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, for the introduction of new matter. Specifically the examiner contends that the specification does not describe an embodiment of the invention comprising a memory, a speaker, and a speech synthesizer.

In response to this objection and rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to remove reference to "a memory for storing information" and "a speech synthesizer for audibly outputting information." However, Applicants have retained reference to a speaker insomuch as the speaker is disclosed in the specification at Page 3, Line 21 and is depicted in the Figures as element 18. Accordingly, this portion of the Examiner's objection and rejection is traversed.

#### 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner next rejected claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being "unpatentable over Becker (US 4,445,871) in view of Breider (US 6,163,280) and further in view of Thompson (US 5,466,154)." The Examiner also rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) "as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Breider and Thompson as applied to claims 1, 4 and 5 above, and further in

view of Kerai (US 20002/0005707)." The Examiner further rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) "as being unpatentable over Becker (US 4,455,871) in view of Breider (US 6,163,280)." Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) "as being unpatentable over Breider (US 6,163,280) in view of Becker and Thompson." Finally claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) "as being unpatentable over Breider in view of Becker and Thompson as applied to claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 above, and further in view of Kerai (US 2002/0005707)." As noted above, Applicants have deleted claims to 5, 6 and 7 and have further amended claim 1. Accordingly, the only claims remaining are claims 1, 3, and 4. Applicants, therefore, are not addressing the rejection of any deleted claims.

In view of the present claim amendments, Applicants are traversing the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 in view of Breider, Becker and Thompson. More specifically, the amended claims now distinctly and positively recite the inventive features of the present invention: namely, i) a system comprising both a portable Braille notetaker and a portable Braille display that can be easily coupled and uncoupled; and ii) a connector that permits power and data to be transferred from the notetaker to the display. It is respectfully submitted that neither Breider, Becker or Thompson (taken either individually or in any possible combination), teach or suggest these inventive features.

The present invention provides a lightweight Perkins-style Braille keyboard that can be used by itself and which is particularly useful to blind or low vision users who need to take notes while traveling or in classroom settings. However, unlike

traditional notetakers, the notetaker of the present invention does not have an integrated Braille display, thereby giving users the option to selectively use a detachable Braille display. Thus, the user, at his or her option, can selectively employ the notetaker in conjunction with the display to facilitate reviewing and editing notes taken by the notetaker. The invention achieves this by way of a pin and slot engagement between the notetaker and the display. Furthermore, the claimed invention includes mating electrical connectors, which can be USB connectors, for use in routing power and data from the notetaker to the Braille display. Again, none of the references uncovered by the Examiner, either taken individually or in any possible combination, disclose these inventive features.

For instance, Becker, US 4,445,871, discloses a means for creating Braille characters on a continuous display band. The device of Becker specifically discloses a tactile writer 4 in the form of a conventional keyboard. See Col. 4, Lines 39-47 and Figs 1 and 21A. Becker does not disclose or teach the use of a Perkins-style keyboard as a means for inputting information. Thus, the data being recorded corresponds to alpha-numeric data and not Braille characters. Equally as important, the device of Becker is not portable. Namely, Becker does not disclose a detachable battery pack for use in supplying power to the writer 4. In the absence of a power supply, writer 4 cannot be used by itself and is not portable.

The device of Breider, US 6,163,280, is most assuredly not portable. Breider discloses a module 9 (that includes a Braille reading line 8 and opposing switch devices 11 and 12) that is adapted to be connected to a desktop computer 3. Since module 9

does not contain a power supply, it cannot be used alone and is not portable. Furthermore, the device of Breider does not employ a Perkins style keyboard and does not function as a notetaker.

Finally, Thompson, US 5,466,154, discloses a Braille board with moveable dot pins that are under the control of a microprocessor 99. A hook-up 3 is provided to allow alpha numeric data to be inputted to the board. Like the other references relied upon by the Examiner, Thompson neither discloses nor suggests the use of a Perkins-style keyboard, nor does it disclose a device which is portable. Rather, Thompson is specifically adapted to be coupled to a conventional computer by way of connector 3. See Col. 3, Lines 48-51.

In light of the aforementioned differences, Applicants urge the Examiner to reconsider his rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the basis of Becker, Breider and Thompson.

The only remaining claims (claims 3 and 4) are dependent upon claim 1. Claim 4 was likewise rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the basis of Becker, Breider and Thompson. Thus, Applicants urge reconsideration of this rejection on the basis of the arguments made hereinabove. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the basis of Becker, Breider and Thompson and further in view of 2002/0005707 to Kerai. Claim 3, as currently amended, specifies that the connector on the notetaker is a USB port. The examiner cited Kerai for a showing of "a USB connection 2 as a conventional electrical connection." However, Kerai does not in any way relate to a notetaker or a Braille display. Accordingly, it cannot anticipate or otherwise render obvious the claimed invention.

Thus, in view of the claim amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the Examiner's various grounds for objection and rejection and further solicit a Notice of Allowance. Nonetheless, should any additional points remain, Applicants are submitting herewith an Interview Request (Form PTOL-413A) so that any remaining issues can be discussed with Applicants' attorney.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required at any time during the prosecution of this application without specific authorization, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1667.

By: /Michael J. Colitz, III/  
Michael J. Colitz, III  
Registration No. 37,010  
Holland & Knight LLP  
Suite 4100  
100 North Tampa Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602-3644  
Telephone: 813/227-8500  
Facsimile: 813/229-0134  
Email: [ptotpa@hklaw.com](mailto:ptotpa@hklaw.com)

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Amendment was filed with the Commissioner for Patents using the USPTO's EFS-Web system on this 6th day of March, 2008.

/Michael J. Colitz, III/  
Michael J. Colitz, III

# 5164649\_v1